(3)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
AUG 30 2006
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 06-120

In The Supreme Court of the United States

TILVA L. SOUZA, WILLIAM R. SOUZA, JOE O. SOUZA, JR., ROBERT J. SOUZA and CAROL DROBNY,

Petitioners,

vs.

WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT and ACCO FINANCE CO., INC.,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA, FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Lawrence E. DeWitt
(Counsel of Record)
J. David Petrie
BORTON, PETRINI & CONRON, LLP
2014 Tulare Street, Suite 830, Fresno, CA 93721
Telephone: (559) 268-0117
Facsimile: (559) 237-7995

Counsel for Respondent, WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT

QUESTIONS PRESENTED[1]

1. Whether Petitioners have presented compelling reasons to grant the Petition where Petitioners do not claim that a state court of last resort has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with a decision of another state court of last resort or of a United States court of appeal; as Petitioners failed to present in the lower courts the threshold Constitutional issue of violation of due process other than by a single parenthetical reference in their trial brief to "due process rights," unaccompanied by argument or citation of authority of any kind and thus, the Constitutional issue was never decided.

2. Whether Petitioners have presented compelling reasons to grant the Petition where Petitioners do not claim that the Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District, has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the relevant decisions of this Court; as Petitioners failed to present in the lower courts the threshold Constitutional issue of violation of due process other than by a single parenthetical reference in their trial brief to "due process rights," unaccompanied by argument or citation of authority of any kind and thus, the Constitutional issue was never decided.

3. Whether Petitioners have presented compelling reasons to grant the Petition, where the California Supreme Court denied without comment Petitioners' Petition for Review of the Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District's

---

[1]Petitioners' "Questions" bear little resemblance to the issues actually raised by the record and decided by the lower courts. Respondent therefore restates the questions presented by this case.

opinion, reversing the Superior Court's judgment and holding that Westlands Water District properly levied an assessment pursuant to the California Water Code and Petitioners were not entitled to avoid an otherwise valid assessment even if a water district failed to follow an internal procedure.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS BELOW

The plaintiffs below are petitioners Tilva L. Souza, William R. Souza, Joe O. Souza, Jr., Robert J. Souza and Carol Drobny, individuals.

A defendant below is respondent Westlands Water District, a California water district and public agency of the State of California under California Water Code sections 34000, et seq.

A defendant below is ACCO Finance Company, a Delaware Corporation.

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.6, Respondent Westlands Water District states that it is a California Water District and Public Agency of the State of California under California Water Code sections 34000, et seq. Therefore, no stock in Westlands Water District exists which would be available for ownership by any parent corporations or publicly held companies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED ..... *i*

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS BELOW ..... *iii*

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT ..... *iii*

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... *iv*

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... *vii*

CITATION OF REPORTED OPINION 1

STATUTES INVOLVED 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 3

I. Statement of Facts 3

II. Procedural History 5

SUMMARY OF REASONS TO DENY THE PETITION . 9

REASONS FOR DENYING PETITION 11

I. A California State Court of Last Resort Has Not Decided An Important Federal Question In A Way That Conflicts With A Decision Of Another State Court of Last Resort Or Of A United States Court Of Appeal 11

II. The Court Of Appeal Of California, Fifth Appellate District, Has Not Decided An Important Question Of Federal Law That Has Not Been, But Should Be, Settled By This Court, Nor Has It Decided An Important Federal Question In A way That Conflicts With The Relevant Decisions of This Court 12

III. Denial Of The Petition Is Proper Where The State Court Based Its Decision On A Local And State Question, The California Supreme Court Denied The Petition For Review Without Comment, A Federal Question Was Not Presented And Decided, And It's Decision Was Not Necessary To The Cause 14

IV. Petitioners Were Afforded Due Process And Multiple Opportunities To Challenge The Accuracy And Validity Of Westlands' Assessment, Including Opportunities To Assert Any Claim For Violation Of Constitutional Protections 15

A. Petitioners Fail To Acknowledge That They Have Been Afforded Due Process And Misstate The Law. 15

B. Petitioners Cannot Claim They Were Denied Due Process Of Law In Levying The Assessment, Where They Failed To Avail Themselves Of Their Opportunity To Be Heard On The Constitutional Issue, And Misstate The Law In That Regard 17

CONCLUSION 21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES *Page(s)*

American Farm Lines v. Black Ball Freight Services,
397 U.S. 532, 538 (1970). 15, 16

Anniston Mfg. Co. v. Davis,
301 U.S. 337 (1937). 19, 20

Brown v. Atwell,
92 U.S. 327, 329 (1876) 14

Campbell v. Olney,
262 U.S. 352, 3654 (1923) 18

City of Huntington Park v. Superior Court,
34 Cal. App. 4th 1293, 1299 (1995) 13

Cox v. Texas,
202 U.S. 446, 452 (U.S. 1906) 14

Dower v. Richards,
151 U.S. 658 12

Egan v. Hart,
165 U.S. 188 12

Giles v. Teasley,
193 U.S. 146, 160 (1904). 11

Hartford Life Ins. Co. v. Johnson,
249 U.S. 490, 493 (1919). 11

Hershey v. Reclamation Dist. No. 108,
200 Cal. 550, 564 (1927) 12

Lawler v. Walker,
55 U.S. 149, 152 (1852). 13

Live Oak Water Users' Asso. v. Railroad Com. of California,
269 U.S. 354, 357 (1926) 11

McKesson Corp. v. Div. of Alcoholic Bevs. & Tobacco,
496 U.S. 18, 39 (1990) 18, 19

New York Life Ins. Co. v. Hendren,
92 U.S. 286, 287 (1876). 14

NLRB v. Monsanto Chemical Co.,
205 F.2d 763, 764 (8th Cir. 1953). 16

Orff v. United States,
358 F.3d 1137, 1145 (9th Cir. 2004) 17

Orff v. United States,
125 S.Ct. 2606 (2005) 17

Quimby v. Boyd,
128 U.S. 488 12

Rosenberg v. Fleuti,
374 U.S. 449, 451 (1963) 13

Souza v. Westlands Water District et al,
135 Cal.App.4th 879 (2006) 1, 7

Thayer v. Spratt,
189 U.S. 346 12

Tolchin v. Supreme Court,
111 F.3d 1099, 1155 (3rd Cir. 1997) 16, 17

United States v. Caceres,
440 U.S. 741 (1979) 16

Waters-Pierce Oil Co. v. Texas,
212 U.S. 86, 97 (1909) 12

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Constitution, Amendment 14, §1 1

FEDERAL STATUTES

28 U.S.C. §1257 1
48 Stat. 31, 35, 40 19
U.S. Supreme Court Rules of Court, Rule 14.1(g)(i) ... 9, 11

CALIFORNIA STATUTES

Government Code sections 900, et seq. 15
Revenue & Tax Code sections 901-917 19
Rules of Court, Rule 3 7
Water Code section 36729 5
Water Code section 36832 10
Water Code section 37823 3

CITATION OF REPORTED OPINION

Souza v. Westlands Water District et al. (2006) 135 Cal.App.4th 879 [38 Cal.Rptr.3d 78], Appendix A-1.

STATUTES INVOLVED

USCS Const. Amend. 14, §1

Sec. 1. [Citizens of the United States.]

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

28 U. S. C. §1257. State courts; certiorari

(a) Final judgments or decrees rendered by the highest court of a State in which a decision could be had, may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari where the validity of a treaty or statute of the United States is drawn in question or where the validity of a statute of any State is drawn in question on the ground of its being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States, or where any title,

right, privilege, or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the Constitution or the treaties or statutes of, or any commission held or authority exercised under, the United States.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the term "highest court of a State" includes the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I. Statement of Facts

For at least 25 years the Petitioners have farmed or leased real property located in an area served by Westlands. (RT p. 199:8-22[2]) On February 28, 1999, the Petitioners leased their property to Forrest and Edna Beebower, dba Beebower Farms ("Beebower") for a three-year term. (CT Vol. 1 of 3, pp. 14-24) The lease, to which Westlands was not a party, provided that Beebower was responsible for all assessments for water allocations and for all water services supplied to the property. (CT Vol. 1 of 3, p. 15, ¶7) Westlands is a public agency. Water Code § 37823. Westlands provided irrigation water to Beebower under an Agricultural Water Application and Water User Purchase Agreements between Beebower and Westlands for water years 1999/2000 and 2000/2001. ("Water Agreement" CT Vol. 1 of 3, pp. 25-28, 46-47) Because of Beebower's delinquent payments in the 1999/2000 water year, pursuant to its Regulations for the Allocation and Use of Agricultural Water Within the Westlands Water District

---

[2]The Clerk's Transcripts on Appeal are comprised of 4 sets, separately bound as follows: Volumes 1-3, numbered as pp. 1-300 (Vol. 1), 301-600 (Vol. 2), and 601-662 (Vol. 3); Volumes 1-2, numbered as pp. 0001-0300 (Vol. 1) and 0301-0359 (Vol. 2); Supplemental Volume 1, numbered as pp. 1-91; and Supplemental Volume 1, numbered as pp. 1-85. Reference is made herein to the Clerk's Transcripts on Appeal as "CT Vol. ___ of ___, p. ___" and to the Clerk's Supplemental Transcripts on Appeal as "SCT. p. ___of ___."

The Reporter's Transcripts on Appeal are comprised of 4 Volumes, consecutively numbered as pp. 1-271 (Vol. 1); 272-495 (Vol. 2); 496-788 (Vol. 3); and 789-1039 (Vol. 4). Reference is made herein to the Reporter's Transcript on Appeal as "RT p. ___."

("Regulations" CT Vol. 1 of 3, pp. 146-153) and the Terms and Conditions for Agricultural Water Service ("Terms and Conditions" CT Vol. 1 of 3, pp. 138-145), Westlands required Beebower to either pay estimated water charges in advance, or to secure a guarantee for delinquent water charges from a recognized financial institution. ACCO Finance Company ("ACCO") provided Westlands a Guarantee dated April 3, 2000 (SCT p. 8 of 91), for the guaranteed payment of delinquent amounts owed to Westlands on the Beebower Water User Account.

The Guarantee provided that ACCO would pay Westlands for any delinquent water charges after April 3, 2000 in an amount up to $98,306.00 upon Westlands providing ACCO copies of unpaid invoices within 10 days of any delinquency. The ACCO Guarantee dollar amount, at the time of acceptance, appeared to Westlands to be more than sufficient to cover the estimated charges that could accrue to Beebower's Water User Account based upon the allocated acre feet of water remaining in Beebower's Account at that time, multiplied by the estimated cost of the water (RT pp. 766:13-768:16; CT Vol. 1 of 3, p. 208). Dave Ciapponi, Westlands' Assistant General Manager, signed the ACCO Guarantee. (SCT p. 8 of 91)

In late August 2000, Beebower exceeded his water allocation and on August 26, 2000, his account again became delinquent. (RT pp. 502:11-511:4; CT Vol. 1 of 3, p. 197) Beebower became further delinquent again on September 29, 2000. (RT pp. 504:24-505:1) Westlands demanded payment from ACCO under the Guarantee. (SCT p. 33 of 91) On or about October 11, a final payment from ACCO was received. (SCT p. 34 of 91) That payment was insufficient to cover the water used by Beebower between August 26, 2000 and September 29, 2000. (SCT p. 34 of 91) On October 11, 2000,

Westlands sent a letter to ACCO requesting that ACCO pay the additional amount Westlands believed was still due under the Guarantee. (SCT p. 34 of 91) ACCO did not pay the additional amounts demanded by Westlands on October 11, 2000. (RT p. 731:4-22)

In May 2001, assessments consisting of unpaid water charges in excess of the ACCO Guarantee, penalties and interest, were levied upon the Petitioners' real property pursuant to California Water Code section 36729. (CT Vol. 1 of 2, pp. 0021-0022) On August 7, 2001 Forest and Edna Beebower filed a Chapter 7 Bankruptcy Petition, and on November 8, 2001 their debts were discharged[3]. On February 25, 2002, The Souzas paid Westlands $105,052.95 to remove the lien from their property. (RT pp. 303:8-304:14)

II. Procedural History

On October 5, 2001, the Petitioners filed a Notice of Claims Against Public Entity with Westlands. (CT Vol. 1 of 3, pp. 228-244) Petitioners stated eight claims: Breach of Written Agreement (Westlands' Water Agreement, of which the Petitioners claimed to be third-party beneficiaries); Breach of Oral Agreement; Breach of Fiduciary Duty; Negligent Misrepresentation; Negligence; Promissory Estoppel; To Remove Cloud on Title; and Indemnity. Petitioners did not assert a claim for violation of their Constitutional rights. On November 19, 2001, Westlands' Board of Directors considered and rejected Petitioners' claim. (CT Vol. 1 of 3, pp. 194-196, 224) Petitioners filed the instant action against Westlands on

---

[3]Although these events were not formally in evidence, they are not in dispute and were presented to the court in opening statements. (RT p. 41:11-14)

March 4, 2002 in the Superior Court of Fresno County. (CT Vol. 1 of 2, pp. 0001-0024) On April 24, 2002, the Petitioners filed a Claim for Refund of Invalid Assessment with Westlands, incorporating by reference the facts, circumstances, allegations and claims set forth in their Notice of Claims Against Public Entity. (CT Vol. 1 of 3, pp. 216-220, 228-244) After their claim for refund was considered and denied by Westlands' Board of Directors on May 20, 2002 (CT Vol. 1 of 3, p. 215), Petitioners filed a First Amended Complaint on July 16, 2002. (CT Vol. 1 of 2, pp. 0034-0049)

Petitioners' initial complaint, and the first amended complaint, contained the identical eight causes of action against Westlands that were asserted in their Notice of Claims Against Public Entity. (CT Vol. 1 of 2, pp. 0001-0024, 0034-0049; CT Vol. 1 of 3, pp. 228-244) During trial, Petitioners requested leave to amend their complaint further to add a cause of action for refund of an erroneous or invalid assessment to conform to proof. The court granted the request over Westlands' objections. (RT pp. 840:17-841:9, 878:12-884-5; CT Vol. 1 of 3, pp. 245-260)

The matter was tried as a bifurcated trial, initially to the court alone on the issue of the governmental immunities pled as affirmative defenses. (RT pp. 3:1-4:24) Although the court found in favor of Westlands on various causes of action based on tort, the court found that the Petitioners' claim of express breach of contract based on alleged status as a third party beneficiary, the cause of action for indemnity, and refund of an erroneous or invalid assessment to be outside the scope of the immunities, and thus Petitioners proceeded to trial. (RT pp. 272:1-278-23)

Following the close of evidence and oral argument, the court invited each side to submit a Proposed Statement of Decision. (RT pp. 1016:25-1017:17). Although the court found in favor of Westlands on the indemnity claim, it ultimately found in favor of the Petitioners on the breach of contract and erroneous or invalid assessment theories. (CT Vol. 1 of 3, pp. 272-300) Westlands submitted written objections and the court scheduled oral argument. (CT Vol. 2 of 3, pp. 301-339; RT pp. 1018:1-1038:19) No alteration of the court's conclusions resulted. Judgment on the statement of decision was entered February 5, 2004. (CT Vol. 2 of 3, pp. 354-357) Notice of Appeal was filed by Westlands on April 19, 2004, and was timely under California Rules of Court, Rule 3. (CT Vol. 2 of 2, pp. 0327-0328)

The Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District, rendered its opinion on January 17, 2006[4]. The Court of Appeal found there was "no authority for the trial court's novel view that a landowner is entitled to avoid an otherwise valid assessment if a water district failed to follow an internal procedure." The Court of Appeal reversed the decision below in its entirety and held that Westlands' assessment was properly levied pursuant to the California Water Code and that the evidence failed as a matter of law to prove an invalid assessment. (Appendix, pp. A-10-16) The Court of Appeal also held on undisputed facts that, as a matter of law, the trial court erred in allowing Petitioners to recover for breach of contract on a third-party beneficiary theory, as Paragraph 21 of Westlands' Terms and Conditions was not designed to benefit Petitioners as individuals but, rather, to benefit the District as a whole. (Appendix, pp. A-16-26)

---

[4]*Souza v. Westlands Water District et al.* (2006) 135 Cal.App.4th 879 is attached hereto as Appendix A.

As part of their cross-appeal, the Petitioners argued for the first time that the addition of the water charges to the assessment on their land violated their Constitutional right to equal protection. (Appendix, pp. A-26-30) The Court of Appeal held that the Petitioners were not entitled to raise new issues for the first time on appeal and declined to reach the equal protection issue. (Appendix, pp. A-29-30) The Petitioners argued to the Court of Appeal that their trial brief raised Constitutional issues, but as the Court noted, no argument or citation to authority of any kind accompanied Petitioners' parenthetical reference to "due process rights." (Appendix, p. A-29, Fn. 5) The Court of Appeal determined that the issue of equal protection was a new substantive theory of liability, concerning the unconstitutionality of the operative statue, that was not litigated at all in the trial court. (Appendix, p. A-29)

The Petitioners generally asserted in their Petition for Review to the California Supreme Court[5], for the first time and without citation to law, that principles of due process had been violated by Westlands' actions. (Petition for Review. pp. 3-4, 24-25) Petitioners' new argument in their Petition here is that the decision of the Court of Appeal allowed Westlands to violate Petitioners' Constitutional due process rights, and deprived Petitioners of a remedy. As in their brief to the Court of Appeal, Petitioners have now asserted another completely new substantive theory of liability that was not presented, litigated, nor ruled on at trial nor at the Court of Appeal and, therefore, this Court should deny the Petition.

---

[5]Petitioners Petition for Review to the California Supreme Court was denied without comment on April 26, 2006.

SUMMARY OF REASONS TO DENY THE PETITION

The Souzas' (hereinafter "Petitioners") Petition should be denied because Petitioners have not complied with Supreme Court Rule 14.1 (g)(i). The Petition does not show that a claim under the federal Constitution was presented in the lower courts with sufficient definiteness for this Court to say that the lower courts' attention was challenged, or that the lower courts considered or necessarily passed upon any such question. Therefore, Petitioners cannot claim that a state court of last resort has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with a decision of another state court of last resort or of a United States court of appeal. Likewise, Petitioners cannot claim that the Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District, has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the relevant decisions of this Court.

The Petitioners' Petition should be denied because Petitioners failed to explicitly and timely raise the Constitutional issue of denial of due process in their attack upon the Westlands Water District's (Hereinafter "Westlands") assessment in the state court. Because Petitioners did not present the issue of denial of due process to the state court, Petitioners failed to avail themselves of the opportunity to have the federal question decided in the state courts. Therefore, the decision of the Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District, necessarily determined only that the laws of the state of California were complied with. The Supreme Court of the United States lacks jurisdiction to review a determination of a California court wherein the laws of the state were complied with in levying an assessment, and where no federal question was invoked or implicated.

Furthermore, the Petition should be denied because Petitioners were, in fact, afforded due process and a fair opportunity to challenge the accuracy and validity of Westlands' assessment, including multiple opportunities to assert any claim for violation of Constitutional protections. Prior to filing suit in the superior court, Petitioners submitted two claims to Westlands' Board of Directors challenging the assessment pursuant to California Water Code section 36832 and Westlands' regulations. Following hearings and Westlands' subsequent rejection of their claims, Petitioners filed suit in superior court. While at trial on the matter, Petitioners amended their complaint for a second time to add an additional cause of action, "Refund of Erroneous Assessment." However, a violation of Petitioners' Constitutional right to due process was not pled in their complaints nor argued in the superior court, and was not pled nor argued in Petitioners' appeal. The federal issue was only raised by Petitioners, for the first time, in their Petition for Review to the California Supreme Court. The California Supreme Court denied the Petition without comment, and the issue was never decided in state court. Petitioners were provided independent and adequate procedural safeguards against unlawful deprivation, due process was satisfied, and the Court should therefore deny the Petitioners' Petition because the case does not qualify for or otherwise merit review in this Court.

REASONS FOR DENYING PETITION

I. A California State Court of Last Resort Has Not Decided An Important Federal Question In A Way That Conflicts With A Decision Of Another State Court of Last Resort Or Of A United States Court Of Appeal

The Petition should be denied on procedural grounds because Petitioners have not complied with Supreme Court Rule 14.1 (g)(i). *Live Oak Water Users' Asso. v. Railroad Com. of California*, 269 U.S. 354, 357 (1926). Petitioners have failed in their statement of the case to set forth, by specific quotation of pertinent portions of the record, when the federal questions sought to be reviewed were raised, the method or manner of raising them, and the way in which they were passed on by the state courts. The Petition does not reference the violation of equal protection argument that the Court of Appeal declined to decide, nor Petitioners' "hint of a constitutional issue" in a parenthetical reference to "due process rights" violation found in their trial brief. The Petition does not show that a claim under the federal Constitution was presented in the lower courts with sufficient definiteness for this Court to say that the lower courts' attention was challenged, or that the lower courts considered or necessarily passed upon any such question. *Live Oak Water Users' Asso.*, *supra*, 269 U.S. at 357.

It is well settled that if the decision of the state court rested on an independent ground, this Court has no jurisdiction to review the judgment of the state court. *Giles v. Teasley*, 193 U.S. 146, 160 (1904). Petitioners do not suggest that the decision of the Court of Appeal was improperly framed to evade consideration of the federal right now asserted. *Hartford Life Ins. Co. v. Johnson*, 249 U.S. 490, 493 (1919).

Furthermore, the general rule in California applicable in civil cases is that a constitutional question must be raised at the earliest opportunity or it will be considered waived. *Hershey v. Reclamation Dist. No. 108*, 200 Cal. 550, 564 (1927). The jurisdiction of this Court to review the proceedings of the state courts is limited to the specific instances of denials of federal rights, specially set up in the state court and denied by the rulings and judgment of that court. *Waters-Pierce Oil Co. v. Texas*, 212 U.S. 86, 97 (1909). This Court is not called upon to review the findings of facts made in the state court, but accepts the findings of the court of the State upon matters of fact as conclusive. *Id.*, citing *Quimby v. Boyd*, 128 U.S. 488; *Egan v. Hart*, 165 U.S. 188; *Dower v. Richards*, 151 U.S. 658; and *Thayer v. Spratt*, 189 U.S. 346. Where, as here, the federal question was never drawn into question or decided by a state court, it cannot be said that the decision of the state court conflicts with the Constitutional decisions of other state courts of last resort or of a United States Court of Appeal.

II. The Court Of Appeal Of California, Fifth Appellate District, Has Not Decided An Important Question Of Federal Law That Has Not Been, But Should Be, Settled By This Court, Nor Has It Decided An Important Federal Question In A way That Conflicts With The Relevant Decisions of This Court

The conflict of a California law with the Constitution of the United States, and a decision by a California court in favor of its validity, does not appear on the face of the record. Before the decision of the Court of Appeal can be re-examined in this Court, it must appear in the pleadings of the suit, or from the evidence in the course of trial, in the instructions asked for, or from exceptions taken to the rulings of the court, that such a question was necessarily involved in the decision, and that the

California court would not have given a judgment without deciding it. *Lawler v. Walker*, 55 U.S. 149, 152 (1852).

In Petitioners' Notice of Claims Against Public Entity filed with Westlands on October 5, 2001, Petitioners stated eight separate claims, but did not assert a single claim for violation of their Constitutional rights. Likewise, the Petitioners' Claim for Refund of Invalid Assessment filed with Westlands on April 24, 2002, incorporated by reference the facts, circumstances, allegations and claims set forth in their Notice of Claims Against Public Entity, but did not add a claim for violation of Constitutional rights. Petitioners' complaint and first amended complaint contained the identical eight causes of action against Westlands, asserted in their Notice of Claims Against Public Entity but, again, there was no claim for violation of Constitutional rights. During trial, Petitioners requested and were granted leave to further amend their complaint to add a cause of action for refund of an erroneous or invalid assessment but, again, no claim for violation of Constitutional rights was alleged.

Petitioners first asserted, as part of their cross-appeal, that Westlands' additions of the water charges to the assessment on their land violated their Constitutional right to equal protection of the laws. The Court of Appeal declined to decide the issue when it held that the Petitioners were not entitled to raise new issues for the first time on appeal. In reaching this decision, the Court of Appeal correctly stated that the decision to consider this new issue for the first time on appeal was within the court's discretion and noted the court's obligation to avoid deciding Constitutional issues unless absolutely necessary to do so. *City of Huntington Park v. Superior Court*, 34 Cal. App. 4th 1293, 1299 (1995), citing *Rosenberg v. Fleuti*, 374 U.S. 449, 451 (1963). Because the Court of Appeal did not

decide an important question of federal law, this Court lacks jurisdiction to review the Court of Appeal decision.

III. Denial Of The Petition Is Proper Where The State Court Based Its Decision On A Local And State Question, The California Supreme Court Denied The Petition For Review Without Comment, A Federal Question Was Not Presented And Decided, And It's Decision Was Not Necessary To The Cause

The case presented in the superior court and ultimately decided in the Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District, was based upon general principles of contract and tort law and, specifically, on the California Water Code. Nowhere in the record does it appear that the protections of the United States Constitution, laws, treaties, or executive proclamations were presented to the lower courts and necessarily involved in the decisions. This Court's jurisdiction over the decisions of the state is not derived from the citizenship of the parties, but from the questions involved and decided. *New York Life Ins. Co. v. Hendren*, 92 U.S. 286, 287 (1876).

Even assuming this Court sustained Petitioners' argument that a federal question was argued or presented to the lower California courts for decision, it does not appear from the record that the decision was necessary to the determination of the cause, and that it was actually decided, or that the judgment as rendered could not have been given without deciding it. *Brown v. Atwell*, 92 U.S. 327, 329 (1876). Where, as here, it does not appear that the Court of Appeal previously dealt with the Constitutional issue on the ground that the federal question was not before the trial court, this Court cannot say that the Court of Appeal erred. *Cox v. Texas*, 202 U.S. 446, 452 (U.S. 1906). Without more, the Petition should be denied.

IV. Petitioners Were Afforded Due Process And Multiple Opportunities To Challenge The Accuracy And Validity Of Westlands' Assessment, Including Opportunities To Assert Any Claim For Violation Of Constitutional Protections

A. Petitioners Fail To Acknowledge That They Have Been Afforded Due Process And Misstate The Law.

In their Petition, Petitioners do not mention that prior to filing their civil action they were afforded two administrative hearings before Westlands' Board of Directors to present their claims in accordance with California Government Code sections 900, et seq., California's Tort Claims Act. Petitioners were provided an opportunity to be heard and Westlands' Board of Directors investigated and considered their claims before the claims were rejected. Petitioners were also provided notice of their right to file a court action in the notice of claim rejection and, thereafter, filed the suit giving rise to this Petition.

Apparently, Petitioners contend the trial court was correct in its "novel view that a landowner is entitled to avoid an otherwise valid assessment if a water district fails to follow an internal procedure" because now, Petitioners claim that Westlands' failure to comply with Paragraph 21 of its Terms and Conditions resulted in an illegal sale of water to Petitioners' tenant and invalidated Westlands' assessment power under the Water Code. Petitioners state at page 19 of their Petition, that due process requires an agency to follow its own regulations and "where internal regulations afford procedural protections rather than facilitate agency housekeeping, the Court has insisted on compliance" with regulations designed to safeguard individual interests. For authority, Petitioners cite *American*

Farm Lines v. Black Ball Freight Services, 397 U.S. 532, 538 (1970).

The Petitioners neglect to mention that this Court, in *American Farm Lines*, found that the agency rules at issue in that case were not intended primarily to confer important procedural benefits on individuals and held in favor of the agency's actions. *American Farm Lines*, *supra*, 397 U.S. at 538-539. Petitioners also fail to inform this Court in their Petition that the Court of Appeal held that Paragraph 21 of Westlands' Terms and Conditions was not designed to benefit Petitioners as individuals but, rather, to benefit the District as a whole. In *American Farm Lines*, this Court also held that there was no reason to exempt the case from the general principle that "it is always within the discretion of a court or an administrative agency to relax or modify its procedural rules adopted for the orderly transaction of business when in a given case the ends of justice require it." *Id.* at 539, emphasis added, citing *NLRB v. Monsanto Chemical Co.*, 205 F.2d 763, 764 (8th Cir. 1953).

Petitioners contend at page 20 of the Petition that the "due process clause is invoked where, as here, 'an individual has reasonably relied on agency regulations promulgated for his guidance or benefit and has suffered substantially because of their violation by the agency'," citing *Tolchin v. Supreme Court*, 111 F.3d 1099, [1155] sic (3rd Cir. 1997). Not only do Petitioners provide the incorrect page number of the quoted portion of the case, but Petitioners take the quotation out of context resulting in a misstatement of the law. This Court in *Tolchin* provided that, "[A]n agency's failure to follow its rules and regulations, however, is not a per se violation of due process." *Tolchin*, *supra*, 111 F.3d at 1155, citing *United States v. Caceres*, 440 U.S. 741 (1979). The court in *Tolchin* went on

to state that "only when an agency violates regulations mandated by the Constitution or by law; or when 'an individual has reasonably relied on agency regulations promulgated for his guidance or benefit and has suffered substantially because of their violation by the agency'," is the Due Process Clause implicated. *Id* at 1155. Petitioners did not present, and the Court of Appeal did not decide, the case below on the issue of Westlands' violation of Constitutional rights.

In addition, Petitioners fail to acknowledge that the Court of Appeal did not find that Westlands promulgated its rules for the guidance and benefit of the individual Petitioners but, rather, for the District as a whole. Recently, the Ninth Circuit held that Westlands' landowners and water users who "benefit from a government contract are generally assumed to be incidental beneficiaries, and may not enforce the contract absent a clear intent to the contrary." *Orff v. United States*, 358 F.3d 1137, 1145 (9th Cir. 2004). This Court, in ultimately deciding the issues, did not disturb the Ninth Circuit's relevant analysis and determination that Westlands' landowners and water users were not intended third-party beneficiaries of a contract between Westlands and the Bureau of Reclamation. *Orff v. United States*, 125 S. Ct. 2606 (2005).

B. Petitioners Cannot Claim They Were Denied Due Process Of Law In Levying The Assessment, Where They Failed To Avail Themselves Of Their Opportunity To Be Heard On The Constitutional Issue, And Misstate The Law In That Regard.

Petitioners claim in their Petition at page 28 that "[D]ue process requires a fair opportunity to challenge the accuracy and legal validity of a tax and a 'clear and certain remedy' if an

unlawful tax is paid to ensure that the opportunity to contest the tax is a meaningful one," and cite *McKesson Corp. v. Div. of Alcoholic Bevs. & Tobacco,* 496 U.S. 18, 39 (1990). Petitioners fail to acknowledge that *McKesson* also provides that a state-court judgment is unreviewable where, as here, it rests on an independent and adequate state-law ground. *McKesson, supra,* 496 U.S. at 31. Because Petitioners did not specifically raise the Constitutional issue in the California state courts and the issue was not decided, the judgment of the Court of Appeal necessarily determines that the state laws were complied with and unless a federal right is involved, the state court's application of local laws should not be reviewed here. *Campbell v. Olney,* 262 U.S. 352, 354 (1923).

Petitioners claim at page 28 of the Petition that they were denied due process when the Court of Appeal failed "to recognize, let alone craft, a meaningful post-deprivation remedy." Petitioners' reliance on *McKesson* is misplaced where this Court recognized that "States have a legitimate interest in sound fiscal planning and that this interest is sufficiently weighty to allow States to withhold pre-deprivation relief for allegedly unlawful tax assessments, providing post-deprivation relief only." *McKesson, supra,* 496 U.S. at 50.

This Court, and the Court of Appeal, recognized the importance of insuring a government's financial security and the real threat of allowing taxpayers to litigate their tax liabilities prior to payment. *Id.* at 37. In light of encouraging government financial security, this Court has long held that a State may employ distress sales and other remedies in order to encourage taxpayers to make timely payments "prior to resolution of any dispute over the validity of the tax assessment." *McKesson, supra,* 496 U.S. at 37. The availability of the pre-deprivation hearing provided by Westlands to Petitioners constituted a

procedural safeguard against unlawful deprivations sufficient, by itself, to satisfy the Due Process Clause. *Id.* at 50. The Petitioners cannot complain if they failed to raise the Constitutional issues when they did avail themselves of the pre-deprivation administrative procedure on two occasions and post-deprivation judicial review in state court on three more occasions.

Even assuming that Petitioners had raised Constitutional issues below, under the holding of *Anniston Mfg. Co.* the Petition should be denied. In *Anniston Mfg. Co. v. Davis*, 301 U.S. 337 (1937), Petitioner filed suit seeking to recover amounts paid as cotton "processing" taxes and as cotton "floor stock" taxes. Unlike the Petitioners here, the Petitioner in *Anniston* challenged the constitutionality of a statute, sections 901-917 of the Revenue Act of 1936. The Revenue Act of 1936 established a special and exclusive administrative procedure before a Board of Review in the Treasury Department, and provided for a judicial review of the Board's decisions with respect to the refunding of cotton processing taxes collected under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

In *Anniston Mfg. Co.* this Court concluded that:

> "[T]he authorized procedure provides for a full and fair hearing and determination of all matters of fact and that, through judicial review, it provides for the protection of all the legal rights of the petitioner including any constitutional right which it may be entitled to invoke with respect to the refund which it seeks. The petitioner may thus obtain through this proceeding whatever judgment its case warrants, a judgment which the Government, by virtue of

the requirement that the Commissioner shall make refund accordingly, binds itself to pay."

Anniston Mfg. Co., supra, 301 U.S. at 357.

CONCLUSION

Petitioners' complaint that they were deprived of due process and a post-deprivation remedy is without merit. The record clearly shows that Petitioners were provided due process, and the Constitutional issues were never specifically raised or decided below. The Petitioners seek review in this Court not because they were deprived of due process, but rather, because the Court of Appeal properly deprived Petitioners of an unjust result granted by the trial court. The Writ of Certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/30/2006 By;_____

Lawrence E. DeWitt
(Counsel of Record)
J. David Petrie
BORTON, PETRINI & CONRON, LLP
2014 Tulare Street, Suite 830
Fresno, CA 93721
Telephone: (559) 268-0117
Facsimile: (559) 237-7995

Counsel for Respondent, WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT

TILVA L. SOUZA, Individually and as Trustee, etc., et al., Plaintiffs and Appellants, v. WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT et al., Defendants and Appellants.

TILVA L. SOUZA, Individually and as Trustee, etc., et al., Plaintiffs and Respondents, v. WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT et al., Defendants and Appellants.

F045293, F046478

COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA, FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

135 Cal. App. 4th 879; 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 78; 2006 Cal. App. LEXIS 41; 2006 Cal. Daily Op. Service 488; 2006 Daily Journal DAR 695

Filed January 17, 2006.
Review Denied April 26, 2006.

PRIOR HISTORY:

Appeal from a Judgment of the Superior Court of Fresno County, No. 02 CE CG 00718, Mark Wood Snauffer, Judge.

DISPOSITION:

The judgments in favor of the Souzas' against the district and ACCO and the award of attorneys' fees are reversed. The court dismissed the Souzas' cross-appeal as moot.

COUNSEL:

Felger & Associates, Warren P. Felger and Jennifer D. Reisz for Plaintiffs and Appellants and for Plaintiffs and Respondents.

Borton, Petrini & Conron, Thomas C. Matychowiak and Lawrence E. DeWitt for Defendant and Appellant Westlands Water District.

McKinley & Capeloto, McKinley & Associates and Robert D. McKinley for Defendant and Appellant ACCO Finance Co.

OPINION:

WISEMAN, J.

By statute, a California water district may add unpaid water charges to its regular assessment against land served by the district. The assessment automatically constitutes a lien on the land, and this is true whether the water was used by the owner or a tenant. This case presents an issue of first impression: Where the water is used by a tenant, does a district forfeit its right to add the charges to the assessment and encumber the land because, had the district followed its own regulations, the tenant would have been required to post adequate security for all the charges in advance or the water would have been turned off? Specifically, does the district lose the statutory rights just described if, pursuant to its regulations, it demands a guaranty before continuing to supply water to a tenant with a history of delinquencies, but then, contrary to its regulations, supplies more water than the guaranty can cover and the tenant again defaults? The trial court's judgment against

Westlands Water District answered this question in the affirmative, effectively converting the district's regulations on delinquent customers from a shield for the district to a sword for delinquent customers' landlords. It ruled that the assessment against the land was invalid because the district violated its regulations when it supplied water without obtaining an adequate guaranty from the tenants. This was error. Assuming the district violated its regulation, no authority supports the notion that the violation gave the owner the right to escape an assessment otherwise valid and authorized by statute.

The trial court was also incorrect in its alternative ruling that the landowners were entitled to enforce the regulations as intended third party beneficiaries of the water agreement between the tenants and the district. The agreement referred to and incorporated the district's regulations. For multiple reasons, however, the owners could not have been third party beneficiaries as a matter of law.

We decline to address the landowners' argument that the assessment violated their right to equal protection of the laws, which they have raised for the first time on appeal. We reverse the judgment against the district and the award of attorneys' fees the owners obtained as prevailing parties.

Finally, we also reverse the judgment in favor of the owners against the guarantor. The court erred in ruling that the owners could recover as third party beneficiaries of the guaranty provided by the tenants to the district.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORIES

The essential facts are undisputed. We draw them primarily from the trial court's statement of decision.

The plaintiffs are members of the Souza family (the Souzas), who own farmland in the area served by defendant Westlands Water District (the district). They leased the land to Forrest and Edna Mae Beebower (the Beebowers) for the period from March 1, 1999, to October 31, 2001. Among other things, the lease required the Beebowers to pay the water bill.

The Beebowers entered into a contract with the district for irrigation water by executing an agricultural water allocation application and purchase agreement (the water agreement) and submitting it to the district. In the water agreement, the Beebowers promised "[t]o comply with the Terms and Conditions for Agricultural Water Service and the Regulations for the Allocation of Agricultural Water ... both of which are incorporated herein as though set forth at length." Paragraph 18 of the terms and conditions provided that "[a]gricultural water service shall not be provided to any water user with delinquent charges ... ." Paragraph 21 of the terms and conditions (paragraph 21) stated:

> "If a water user's delinquent charges are delinquent for 60 days or more ... the General Manager shall require, as a condition of resumption of water service, that advance payment of all water charges be made for the 12-month period immediately following resumption of service, according to a schedule to be determined by the General Manager. A written guaranty in a form satisfactory to the

General Manager from a recognized financial lending institution may be submitted in lieu of advance payment."

During the first year of the lease, at the end of 1999, the Beebowers fell behind in their water payments and had delinquent charges for more than 60 days. The district instructed them by letter to comply with paragraph 21. The letter stated that if the Beebowers used the guaranty option, the guaranty must be sufficient to cover all water used through January 31, 2001.

On February 29, 2000, the Beebowers paid all their outstanding charges and had a zero balance on their account on March 1, the first day of the water year. The Beebowers also obtained a guaranty from defendant ACCO Finance Company (ACCO) for future water payments. The district accepted it on April 4, 2000. It guaranteed payments for water purchased after April 3, 2000, up to $ 98,306, and had an expiration date of October 30, 2000.

At the time the Beebowers were behind in their water payments at the end of 1999 and early 2000, they also fell behind in their rent payments. After they missed the rent payment of $ 175,000 for the second year of the lease, due on November 1, 1999, the Souzas obtained a judgment against them and a writ of possession. The Beebowers subsequently paid the rent, however, and were not evicted.

The Beebowers experienced financial difficulties again in the second year of the lease. They defaulted on their July 2000 water bill for $ 52,586.02. The district submitted that invoice to ACCO, which paid it. The district subsequently obtained payment of $ 14,355.80 from ACCO for additional

delinquent charges. ACCO refused to pay more, claiming that the balance of the $ 98,306 guaranty (i.e., $ 31,364.18) had been consumed by water payments it made on the Beebowers' behalf before they defaulted.

During this period, the Souzas were aware of the Beebowers' financial problems and through their lawyer sent a letter to the district requesting that it provide them with duplicates of the monthly invoices sent to the Beebowers. The district wrote back explaining that copies of each invoice were already being sent to the Souzas and that if they wished additional control over the account, they could substitute themselves as the water users for their parcels. This was never done.

The district continued supplying water to the Beebowers while they were in default and after the ACCO guaranty was exhausted. The Beebowers were never able to pay. On May 15, 2001, the district added the Beebowers' delinquent water charges to the regular assessment on the land. With penalties and interest, the additional assessment was $ 108,308.95.

The Souzas filed a notice of claims against public entity with the district on October 5, 2001, seeking to discharge the assessment. The district denied the Souzas' claims. Next, on December 10, 2001, the Souzas requested that the district waive paragraph 18 of the terms and conditions, barring water service to land on which delinquent charges have been incurred, so that farming operations could continue on the land while they sought judicial relief. The district denied this request also, observing that the Souzas had the ability to pay first and pursue relief afterward. To ensure that water would be supplied to the land the next year, the Souzas paid the additional assessment.

The Souzas then filed this litigation against the district and ACCO. Against the district, the complaint alleged eight causes of action: breach of the written water agreement (of which the Souzas claimed to be third party beneficiaries); breach of an oral promise not to place a lien on the property; breach of fiduciary duty; negligent misrepresentation; negligence; promissory estoppel; removal of cloud on title; and indemnity. Against ACCO, the complaint alleged breach of the guaranty agreement, also under a third party beneficiary theory.

The case was tried to the court sitting without a jury. The trial was bifurcated, with the district presenting its governmental immunity defenses in the first phase. The court ruled that the district had immunity from the Souzas' claims of negligent misrepresentation and negligence. During the second phase, after the plaintiffs rested, the court granted judgment for the district on the Souzas' claims of breach of an oral contract (for lack of evidence), promissory estoppel (by plaintiff's stipulation), and breach of fiduciary duty (no such duty between landowner and water district). After the plaintiffs' closing argument, the plaintiffs stipulated to judgment for the district on the claim for removal of a cloud on title.

During trial, the Souzas requested leave to amend their complaint to conform to proof. They sought leave to add a cause of action for a refund of an invalid assessment. The court granted the request over the district's objection. The amended complaint alleged that the assessment was invalid because it resulted from the district's failure to obtain advance payment from the Beebowers or a guaranty covering all charges. The amended complaint also added ACCO as a defendant on the indemnity claim.

The claims remaining after trial were breach of the water agreement, invalid assessment, indemnity, and breach of the guaranty agreement. The court issued a statement of decision resolving these, relying primarily on the invalid-assessment theory to find for the Souzas. The court reasoned that paragraph 21 had the force of law because it was a quasi-legislative rule promulgated pursuant to authority delegated by the Legislature. The district violated paragraph 21, the court found, because it did not obtain payment from the Beebowers in advance after their delinquency, and did not obtain a guaranty sufficient to cover 12 months of charges. The district should have taken, but did not take, reasonable steps to ensure that the $ 98,306 guaranty was enough, according to the court: Several reasonable methods of projecting the Beebowers' water costs for the year were available to the district, yielding estimates between $ 170,691 to $ 294,000, showing that the guaranty's limit was far too low. Asserting that "Westlands must follow its own rules before levying assessments on plaintiffs' Farmland," the court concluded that the Souzas were entitled to a refund.

The court also found that the district breached the water agreement and that the Souzas could recover for the breach as third party beneficiaries. The district breached the agreement, the court ruled, by violating paragraph 21 of the terms and conditions. Emphasizing the benefit that would have inured to the Souzas if the district had not violated paragraph 21, the court found that the Souzas must have been intended, not incidental, beneficiaries.

The statement of decision further stated that ACCO breached its guaranty agreement when it refused to pay $ 31,364.18 of the face amount after the Beebowers' default

because it had already paid that portion before the default. The court concluded that, because that payment was made before default, it was not a payment under the guaranty, so ACCO was liable to pay it again after the default. The court found that the Souzas were intended third party beneficiaries of the guaranty for the same reasons they were intended third party beneficiaries of the water agreement. It ruled that the district was entitled to a credit for any amount the Souzas should collect from ACCO.

Finally, the court ruled against the Souzas on their indemnity theory against the district. It found there was no oral or written promise by the district to indemnify the Souzas against losses caused by the Beebowers' default and therefore no liability under the doctrine of express contractual indemnity. After mentioning the doctrines of implied contractual indemnity and equitable indemnity, the court made no ruling on them, apparently assuming the Souzas were not relying on those doctrines. The statement of decision does not address the Souzas' indemnity claim against ACCO, presumably because of the ruling on the breach of contract claim against ACCO.

After judgment was entered for the Souzas, they filed a motion for $ 179,449 in attorneys' fees and $ 16,336 in costs. The court granted the motion, awarding the full amount of fees and $ 7,091.99 in costs. The court's order cited Revenue and Taxation Code section 5152 (attorneys' fees for recovery of a void assessment) and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 (attorneys' fees for enforcement of an important right affecting the public interest) as authority for the award.

The district and ACCO appealed from the judgments against them. The Souzas cross-appealed, arguing that the district should not get a credit for amounts the Souzas might

collect from ACCO. In a separate appeal, the district seeks reversal of the attorneys' fees award. [1]

DISCUSSION

I. Validity of the assessment

The district argues that even if it violated paragraph 21, the violation did not justify the trial court's invalidation of a statutorily authorized assessment. The question is one of law, so our review is de novo. (*Hill v. City of Long Beach* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 1684, 1687 [40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 125]; *Dawson v. East Side Union High School Dist.* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 998, 1041 [34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108].)

We agree with the district. The assessment was properly levied pursuant to the Water Code, and there is no authority for the trial court's novel view that a landowner is entitled to avoid

---

[1]On February 1, 2005, the Souzas filed a request that we take judicial notice of the agenda for the district's January 18, 2005, board meeting and of a district notice to landowners dated January 27, 2005. The documents pertain to changes in the district's regulations postdating the events at issue in this case. On July 22, 2005, the district filed a request that we take judicial notice of *Orff v. U. S.* (9th Cir. 1999) 358 F.3d 1137 and *Orff v. U. S.* (2005) __ U. S. __ [162 L. Ed. 2d 544, 125 S. Ct. 2606]. The Souzas filed an opposition to this request.

The material submitted by the Souzas may be judicially noticed pursuant to Evidence Code section 452, subdivisions (b) and (h). The cases submitted by the district must be judicially noticed pursuant to Evidence Code section 451, subdivision (a). Both requests are granted.

an otherwise valid assessment if a water district fails to follow an internal procedure.[2]

The power of a water district's board of directors to impose an assessment for unpaid water charges on the land where the water was used is established by the Water Code:

> "If authorized by the board of directors by resolution, [the assessor shall] add to the assessment of each parcel of land any charges for water and other services, or either, which are unpaid. The amount so added shall be collected and shall constitute a lien as a part of the assessment levied on the parcel upon which the water for which the charges are unpaid was used and upon the lands subject to the unpaid charges for any other services." (Wat. Code, § 36726, subd. (c).)

Water Code section 36825 reiterates that "any unpaid charges for water and other services added to the assessment under the provisions of Section 36726 are a lien on the land and impart notice of the lien to all parties."

Apart from the effect of paragraph 21, it is undisputed that the unpaid water charges were validly added to the assessment against the Souzas' land and became a lien against the land pursuant to statute. The trial court's view was that the

---

[2]The district also argues that, notwithstanding the mandatory language of paragraph 21 ("the General Manager shall require ..."), it had discretion to accept a guaranty that did not cover 12 months of service, and therefore it did not violate paragraph 21. Because of our decision, we need not consider whether this is correct.

violation it found of paragraph 21 vitiated the addition of the charges to the assessment and vitiated the lien. Citing *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, 10 [78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 960 P.2d 1031], it stated that the district's regulations were quasi-legislative rules and had "the dignity of statutes." Therefore, the court ruled, the district "must adhere" to its regulations and "the failure to follow these rules is a violation of the law." Most important, the court ruled that the district "must follow its own rules *before levying assessments on plaintiffs' Farmland*." (Italics added.) Because it did not, the assessment was invalid.

Omitted from this rationale is an explanation why invalidating the assessment and ordering a refund is a proper remedy for the district's violation. The Water Code sections cited above provide simply that, if authorized by the district's board, unpaid water charges shall be added to the assessment on the land on which the water was used, shall be collected, and shall be a lien on the land. They do not provide that the validity of the assessment depends on whether the charges were incurred by an owner or a tenant or whether the district followed its procedures in attempting to obtain payment from a tenant before adding the charges to the assessment. The regulations also do not state or imply that following them is a precondition of the enforceability of the district's statutory rights against landowners.

Even if the district's regulations did purport to disable the district's statutory assessment powers in cases where the regulations were not followed, there is no authority for the view that any such self-imposed disability would be legally effective. Assuming the trial court was correct in characterizing the regulations as quasi-legislative rules entitled to judicial deference and having the status of substantive law under

Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization, supra, 19 Cal.4th 1, there is still no warrant for the view that the district can establish exceptions to its own statutory authority by making regulations and not following them.

The only authorities cited by the trial court in support of its view that the district's violation of paragraph 21 deprived it of its statutory power to assess the unpaid charges against the land are Government Code section 15606 and *Main & Von Karman Associates v. County of Orange* (1994) 23 Cal.App.4th 337, 342 [28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 432]. The Souzas' brief cites no authority at all for the view that the district's violation of paragraph 21 forfeited its right to add the unpaid water charges to the assessment on the land.

In any event, neither authority is much help to the Souzas' case. The parts of Government Code section 15606 cited by the court provide that the State Board of Equalization shall "[p]rescribe rules and regulations to govern local boards of equalization when equalizing, and assessors when assessing" and that "[t]his section is mandatory." As no rules promulgated by the State Board of Equalization are at issue in this case, we see no relevance to these provisions. Even assuming, as the court asserted, that paragraph 21 is "analogous" to rules promulgated by the State Board of Equalization in that it is binding on the district, the fact that a rule is binding on a government entity does not, by itself, mean that a citizen, taxpayer, or property owner has a right to any particular remedy if the rule is violated.

Main & Von Karman Associates v. County of Orange, supra, 23 Cal.App.4th 337 involved a county assessor's use of an incorrect valuation method when assessing property taxes. The assessor used a valuation method known as the comparable

sales method to determine the value of a commercial property. Rule 4 of the State Board of Equalization required assessors to make certain adjustments to valuations computed by that method. The adjustments were not made. (*Id.* at pp. 340-341.) The owner appealed the assessment to Assessment Appeals Board No. 1 for Orange County, which affirmed the assessor on the issue of methodology. (*Id.* at pp. 340, 341-342.) The superior court denied the owner's petition for a writ of mandate. (*Id.* at p. 342.) Reversing, the Court of Appeal held that rule 4 was mandatory. (*Id.* at. pp. 342-343.) It directed that the case be remanded to the assessment appeals board for further hearings consistent with the rule. (*Id.* at p. 344.) The case stands only for the well-settled proposition that if an assessor calculates property taxes using the wrong method, the taxpayer is entitled to an order directing that the taxes be recalculated using the right method. It does not support the notion that an assessment against land for unpaid water charges is invalid because the water district broke a rule requiring it to take certain steps to secure payment from a tenant of the land's owner.

In sum, the trial court relied on a non-sequitur. The charges may have gone unpaid by the tenants partly because the district failed to follow mandatory internal procedures, but that does not suspend the district's statutory authority to levy an assessment for unpaid charges on the land where the water was used.

We recognize the public policy considerations implicated by the trial court's decision in this case. We may take judicial notice of the fact that, without irrigation, Westlands Water District would be a dry place:

> "The Westlands area receives only about seven inches of rainfall per year, primarily during the

> winter months. No dependable source of surface water is found nearby, and the groundwater supply is insufficient and of poor quality. As a result, the District must rely on irrigation with imported water to make the lands agriculturally productive." (Wilson, *Westlands Water District and Its Federal Water: A Case Study of Water District Politics* (1988) 7 Stan. Envtl. L.J. 187, 189, fn. omitted.)

Whether they farm their land or lease it, landowners depend on the functioning of the district to confer economic value on their holdings. In an early case upholding a new irrigation district law and its assessment provisions, the California Supreme Court recognized that the law promoted the common good:

> "[The law] has for its main object the utilizing and improvement of vast tracts of arid and unfruitful soil, desert-like in character, much of it, which, if water in sufficient quantity can be conducted upon and applied to it, may be [placed under cultivation]. Such a general scheme, by which immigration may be stimulated, the taxable property of the state increased, the relative burdens of taxation upon the whole people decreased, and the comfort and advantage of many thriving communities subserved, would seem to redound to the common advantage of all the people of the state, to a greater or less extent." *(Turlock Irrigation Dist. v. Williams* (1888) 76 Cal. 360, 368-369 [18 P. 379].)

Like any other entity, the district must be financially viable in order to function, and its ability to collect water charges is obviously crucial to its financial viability. Paragraph 21 allows the district to take steps to ensure payment by delinquent water users while minimizing the need to resort to assessments. The trial court converted the district's failure to fully implement this benign measure in this case into the basis for a new inroad, unsupported by any authority, on water districts' assessment powers. The right to levy assessments is at the foundation of a water district's statutory authority as a governmental entity and of its ability to obtain payment for its services. These observations are not necessary to augment the reasons for reversal set forth above. They do, however, illustrate the negative consequences that could flow from allowing the trial court's decision to stand.

We hold that the evidence failed as a matter of law to prove an invalid assessment. Because of this conclusion, we need not address the district's contention that the court erred in allowing the Souzas to amend their complaint to add that claim.

II. Breach of contract

The district challenges the trial court's ruling that the district breached the water agreement between it and the Beebowers by violating paragraph 21, and that the Souzas were entitled to recover for that breach as third party beneficiaries. We agree with the district.

"Generally, it is a question of fact whether a particular third person is an intended beneficiary of a contract," which we review under the substantial evidence standard. (*Prouty v. Gores Technology Group* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1225, 1233 [18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 178].) If, however, as here, the issue is

presented to the court on the basis of undisputed facts and uncontroverted evidence and only a question of the application of the law to those facts need be answered, our review is de novo: "[W]here ... the issue [of whether a third party is an intended beneficiary] can be answered by interpreting the contract as a whole and doing so in light of the uncontradicted evidence of the circumstances and negotiations of the parties in making the contract, the issue becomes one of law that we resolve independently." (*Ibid.*)

" 'The test for determining whether a contract was made for the benefit of a third person is whether an intent to benefit a third person appears from the terms of the contract. [Citation.] If the terms of the contract necessarily require the promisor to confer a benefit on a third person, then the contract, and hence the parties thereto, contemplate a benefit to the third person. The parties are presumed to intend the consequences of a performance of the contract.' [Citation.]" (*Prouty v. Gores Technology Group, supra*, 121 Cal.App.4th at p. 1232.) A party need not show that it was intended to benefit as an individual and may prevail by showing that it is a member of a class the parties intended to benefit. (*Ibid.*) At the same time, it is not enough that the third party would incidentally have benefited from performance. (*Martinez v. Socoma Companies, Inc.* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 394, 406 [113 Cal. Rptr. 585, 521 P.2d 841]; *Bancomer, S. A. v. Superior Court* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 1450, 1459 [52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 435].) "The circumstance that a literal contract interpretation would result in a benefit to the third party is not enough to entitle that party to demand enforcement. The contracting parties must have intended to confer a benefit on the third party." (*Neverkovec v. Fredericks* (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 337, 348 [87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 856].) In determining whether the contract contemplates a benefit to the third party, the court must read the contract in light of the circumstances in

which the parties entered into it. (*Garcia v. Truck Ins. Exchange* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 426, 437 [204 Cal. Rptr. 435, 682 P.2d 1100].)

The trial court's ruling misapplied the third party beneficiary doctrine. First, the doctrine presupposes that the defendant made a promise which, if performed, would have benefited the third party. " 'Where one person for a valuable consideration engages with another to do some act for the benefit of a third person ... the party for whose benefit the contract or promise was made, or who would enjoy the benefit of the act, may maintain an action against the promisor for breach of his engagement.' " (*Prouty v. Gores Technology Group*, *supra*, 121 Cal.App.4th at p. 1232.) But the water agreement contains no promise or engagement by the water district to follow paragraph 21 or any other regulation. It is true, as the statement of decision notes, that the water agreement incorporates "as though set forth at length" the terms and conditions for agricultural water service and the regulations for the allocation of agricultural water, which include paragraph 21. A fuller quotation of the same passage, however, shows that the agreement provides as follows:

> "Beebower Farms, herein referred to as 'Water User,' hereby applies for agricultural water for the March 2000-February 2001 Water Year and agrees, as a condition of the allocation and furnishing of any agricultural water during that water year and in accordance with the District's Regulations, as follows: [¶] ... [¶] To comply with the Terms and Conditions for Agricultural Water Service and the Regulations for the Allocation of Agricultural Water, copies of which will be furnished upon request, both of

which are incorporated herein as though set forth at length."

This provision commits *only the water user* to comply with the district's regulations. The district does *not* promise the water user that it will follow its internal procedures in this or any other provision of the agreement. Further, with respect to paragraph 21, there are no grounds for *inferring* a mutual promise, because paragraph 21 only imposes a burden on the water user (advance payment or a guaranty of payment). The water user has no interest in obtaining the water district's promise that it will impose that burden. The district, likewise, had no need to include in the agreement its own promise to do what is in its own interest--no reason, in other words, to make the promise to itself.

If a contract is to be a basis of liability for the district's violation of paragraph 21--a basis independent of the theory that the district cannot levy an assessment unless it follows its own rules--it must be a contract in which the district promises to abide by paragraph 21. The water agreement does not contain that promise.

Second, even if the district had promised the Beebowers that it would follow paragraph 21, there is no evidence in the record that the Beebowers had any intent that the promise would benefit the Souzas. The trial court relied on evidence that

the district intended landowners to benefit from paragraph 21,[3] but that was not the correct inquiry. The point of the third party beneficiary doctrine is to allow a third party to enforce, against a promisor, rights running to the third party for which the *promisee* bargained. The promisor's intent is not at issue (although its knowledge of the promisee's intent may be [see *Martinez v. Socoma Companies, Inc.*, *supra*, 11 Cal.3d at p. 401]). Corbin states: "In third party cases, the right of such party does not depend upon the purpose, motive, or intent of the promisor." (9 Corbin on Contracts (2002) § 776, p. 14.)

Third, the Souzas were neither donee beneficiaries nor creditor beneficiaries and therefore cannot recover as third party beneficiaries at all. The law's focus on the intent of the promisee to secure a benefit for the third party is reflected in the traditional division of third party beneficiaries between donee beneficiaries and creditor beneficiaries. This division appears in section 133 of the Restatement First of Contracts and has been embraced by California courts. (See, e.g., *Martinez v. Socoma Companies, Inc.*, *supra*, 11 Cal.3d at p. 400; *Outdoor*

---

[3]The court mentioned two purported pieces of evidence of the district's intent to benefit landowners: First, paragraph 22 of the terms and conditions for agricultural water service augments paragraph 21 by permitting the district to impose advance payment or other conditions on a water user if it determines that the user's actions "create a financial risk or hardship for the District or its landowners." Second, a letter from the district to the Beebowers dated January 7, 2000, stated that the requirement of advance payment or a guaranty was being imposed pursuant to rules established "in order to protect the District, its water users, and landowners." The Souzas' brief mentions a third purported piece of evidence on this issue: testimony by William Johnston, an engineering consultant for the district. Johnston testified that at one time, the district used "landowner cards" to obtain owners' acknowledgements that they were statutorily required to pay for water if their tenants defaulted. At "[a]bout the same time" that the district adopted the paragraph 21 procedure, it stopped using the cards.

Services, Inc. v. Pabagold, Inc. (1986) 185 Cal.App.3d 676, 681 [230 Cal. Rptr. 73].) Section 302 of the Restatement Second of Contracts eliminated the terms "donee" and "creditor" but retained the same concepts under new descriptions. (See 1 Witkin, Summary of Cal. Law (10th ed. 2005) Contracts, § 687, pp. 773-774.) As will be seen in the following discussion, both types of beneficiaries derive their status from an intent or obligation of a promisee to benefit them. The lack of such an intent or obligation on the part of the promisee defeats the third party's claim.

A donee beneficiary is a party to whom a promisee intends to make a gift (i.e., a benefit the promisee had no duty to confer) of a promisor's performance. An example is the plaintiff in *Gourmet Lane, Inc. v. Keller* (1963) 222 Cal.App.2d 701 [35 Cal. Rptr. 398]. There, the plaintiff, an incorporated association, sued one of its members for failing to bear a share of certain costs, as the member had agreed to do in an agreement among all the members pursuant to which the association was incorporated. (*Id.* at pp. 702-704.) The Court of Appeal affirmed a ruling that the corporation could recover as a third party beneficiary: It was a donee whom the other members intended to benefit by obtaining the promise of payment from the defendant member. (*Id.* at pp. 704-706.) The Souzas were not donee beneficiaries: There is no evidence of any intent on the Beebowers' part to give them anything as a gift.

A creditor beneficiary is a party to whom a promisee owes a preexisting duty which the promisee intends to discharge by means of a promisor's performance. *Wilson v. Anderson* (1962) 208 Cal.App.2d 62 [25 Cal. Rptr. 105] is an illustration. In that case, landowners entered into a contract with broker A to find a buyer for their ranch, but then actually sold

the ranch through broker B. Before the sale, the owners and broker B entered into an oral agreement under which B would pay one-third of his commission to A. When B refused to pay A, A sued as a third party beneficiary of the oral agreement between B and the owners. Affirming a judgment for A, the Court of Appeal stated that A was a creditor beneficiary of the oral agreement. The preexisting obligation between A and the owners was the original brokerage contract between them. (*Id.* at pp. 63-64.)

In this case, the Beebowers did have a preexisting obligation to the Souzas because the lease required the Beebowers to pay the water bill. A promise by the district (if there had been one) to enforce paragraph 21 against the Beebowers, however, could not be construed as a promise by the district to fulfill the Beebowers' lease obligation to pay the water bill. The district's putative promise would be a promise to compel *the Beebowers* to pay the bill or ensure its payment--not a promise to pay the bill *for* the Beebowers. We are aware of no case in which a third party beneficiary contract was formed when a promisee bargained for and obtained a promisor's engagement to force the promisee to satisfy its own obligation to the third party. The Souzas would not be creditor beneficiaries of the water agreement even if it had contained a promise by the district to enforce paragraph 21 against the Beebowers. Consequently, the Souzas were neither donee nor creditor beneficiaries. These are the only two kinds of intended third party beneficiaries, so the Souzas were not intended third party beneficiaries at all. (See *Martinez v. Socoma Companies, Inc.*, *supra*, 11 Cal.3d at pp. 400-403, 407 [plaintiffs who were neither creditor nor donee beneficiaries were not third party beneficiaries].)

Next, by awarding the Souzas a refund, the trial court violated the rule that a third party beneficiary may not obtain a greater recovery than that which would have been available to the promisee. (*Marina Tenants Assn. v. Deauville Marina Development Co.* (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 122, 132 [226 Cal. Rptr. 321].)

> "A third party beneficiary cannot assert greater rights than those of the promisee under the contract. [Citation.] Because the foundation of any right the third person may have is the promisor's contract, '[w]hen [a] plaintiff seeks to secure benefits under a contract as to which he is a third-party beneficiary, he must take the contract as he finds it. ... [T]he third party cannot select the parts favorable to him and reject those unfavorable to him.' [Citation.]" (*Marina Tenants Assn. v. Deauville Marina Development Co.*, *supra*, 181 Cal.App.3d at p. 132.)

Even if the water agreement contained a promise by the district to enforce paragraph 21, the Beebowers could not conceivably have obtained any recovery for a breach of that promise. The contract required the Beebowers to pay for the water. There is no imaginable scenario under which a failure of the district to enforce paragraph 21 could result in relief for the Beebowers from having to pay for water they used. By relying on the district's supposed promise to follow paragraph 21 while ignoring the Beebowers' obligation to pay for the water, the Souzas seek to " 'select the parts [of the agreement] favorable to [them] and reject those unfavorable to [them].' " (*Marina Tenants Assn. v. Deauville Marina Development Co.*, *supra*,

181 Cal.App.3d at p. 132.) The third party beneficiary doctrine does not allow this.

Finally, the Souzas cannot recover on the water agreement as third party beneficiaries because the promisees – the Beebowers--undisputedly breached the agreement and were liable to the promisor--the district--for an amount equal to the amount the Souzas paid. If the promisee breaches the contract, and the damages to the promisor equal or exceed the amount of the benefit the promisor was to confer on the third party, the third party cannot recover. *(Votaw Precision Tool Co. v. Air Canada* (1976) 60 Cal.App.3d 52, 56 [131 Cal. Rptr. 335].) The Beebowers' nonpayment damaged the district in an amount equal to the amount the Souzas claim the enforcement of paragraph 21 would have saved them (the unpaid amount and the amount the Souzas had to pay being the same, of course), so the Souzas cannot recover any refund.

None of the remaining arguments and considerations in the statement of decision on this issue are persuasive. The court stated that the Souzas must be intended and not incidental beneficiaries of the water agreement and that paragraph 21 "would explicitly benefit" them if followed because it would prevent unpaid charges from accruing and therefore would avoid any assessment for unpaid charges. That the Souzas would as a matter of fact benefit would not be enough to show they were intended third party beneficiaries even if the water agreement contained the district's promise to follow paragraph 21. Without more, a party who simply will receive a benefit from performance is only an incidental beneficiary.

The court also stated that "it is clear that *only* the plaintiffs could benefit from Westlands implementing the advance payment requirements on Beebower." Further, "it is

difficult to see who else would benefit" from this, because the unpaid charges could not be transferred to other landowners in the district. Even assuming it is true that the district never passes its bad debt expenses on to its customers (though the court supplied no reason to believe this, and it is hard to see how those expenses could be covered otherwise), the court's conclusion does not follow. Paragraph 21 plainly is designed to benefit the district itself. Like any other business entity, it benefits from self-protective measures taken against customers who present credit risks. The fact that the district has another remedy in its power to assess the charges against the land does not show that it needs no other protection. That remedy involves costs and delays the district has an interest in avoiding. Consequently, there is no need to assume the Souzas were intended to benefit because otherwise paragraph 21 would not benefit anyone. Further, that assumption has the untenable consequence that in cases where the delinquent customer *is* the owner, the rule has no purpose at all and protects no one. (Presumably, no one would argue that the owner can invoke paragraph 21 to avoid payment in *that* situation.)

Finally, the trial court's reliance on *Zigas v. Superior Court* (1981) 120 Cal.App.3d 827 [174 Cal. Rptr. 806] is misplaced. That case involved a contract between landlords and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, pursuant to which the government insured a mortgage on an apartment building purchased by the landlords. In return, the landlords agreed, among other things, to limits on the rents they would charge tenants. The tenants sued the landlords, claiming they were overcharged. (*Id.* at pp. 830-831.) The Court of Appeal held that the tenants could sue on the contract as third party beneficiaries. Based on a review of the underlying statutes, it concluded that the point of the contract was to provide a benefit to the tenants of the building. Further,

the landlords' promise to comply with the rent caps "could *only* benefit the tenants." (*Id.* at pp. 835-836.) Nothing similar is at issue here. Paragraph 21 is a measure to protect the district from credit risks, not a benefit program for landowners. And as we have just explained, the Souzas are not the only parties who could benefit from paragraph 21, as the district itself benefits and the benefit to the district is the point.

Zigas and the present case are disanalogous in other important ways as well. In *Zigas*, the third parties sought to enforce a promise the landlords (the promisors) made to the government (the promisee) and which the promisee intended to benefit the third parties. In this case, the third parties sought to enforce a promise the district did *not* make to the Beebowers which, even if it had been made, was not shown by any evidence to be intended by the promisees (the Beebowers) to be for the benefit of the third parties.

In sum: The water agreement contained no promise by the district that would have benefited the Souzas if performed. If it had, there was still no evidence in the agreement that the promisees (the Beebowers) intended the Souzas to benefit from it. If there had been a promise and the promisees had intended the Souzas to benefit from it, third party recovery of a refund for water charges would still be barred because no recovery by the promisees would have been possible and because the promisees were in breach. For all these reasons, the trial court erred in allowing the Souzas to recover for breach of contract on a third party beneficiary theory.

III. Equal protection

As part of their cross-appeal, the Souzas argue that the addition of the water charges to the assessment on their land

violated their constitutional right to equal protection of the laws. Therefore, they contend, even if the trial court erred in finding for them on the theories discussed above, the judgment should be affirmed. The district contends that we should refuse to reach this constitutional issue because the Souzas did not raise it before the trial court, even though they did raise a related issue of statutory interpretation. We agree with the district's view.

In their trial brief, the Souzas argued that Water Code section 36726 (quoted in part I above) "does not by its express terms permit" the district to add a tenant's unpaid water charges to the assessment on the land--i.e., it states simply that a district may add unpaid charges for water used on the land, without asserting or denying that there is an exception for water used by a tenant--and therefore the provision is "ambiguous." The Souzas urged the trial court to resolve the purported ambiguity by referring to Water Code section 37212. Section 37212 is within part 7.5 of division 13 of the Water Code, which "provides an alternative method for the levy, collection and enforcement of district assessments ... ." (Wat. Code, § 37200.) Any water district may elect to proceed under part 7.5 for the levy of its assessments. (Wat. Code, § 37203.) If a district elects to proceed under part 7.5, the board of supervisors of the county in which the district or a part of the district is located levies and collects assessments, including add-on assessments for unpaid water charges, on behalf of the district. (Wat. Code, § § 37207, 37212.) Unlike section 36726--which applies to districts that (like Westlands) have not elected to proceed under part 7.5--section 37212 provides for add-on assessments for unpaid water charges only where water services were "requested in writing by the owner of the property ... ." (Wat. Code, § 37212, subd. (a)(1).) The Souzas argued that the same limitation should be read into section 36726.

The trial court rejected this argument in a mid-trial ruling. It stated:

> "Contention is made that Water Code section 36726 ... subdivision (c)[,] under which this assessment was made[,] ... was ambiguous and should be read in connection with other code sections ... . It's my conclusion that Water Code section 36726(c) is unambiguous on its face and clearly in my view allows assessments against the whole parcel of land ... . While it does not make specific reference to a landlord, it is clear that a parcel of land contemplates an owner of some kind, and I think that--and I will say this, the argument made by the plaintiffs in this case was extremely inventive, and I mean that sincerely, not in any sense sarcastically at all. It's something that wouldn't even have occurred to me, and I understand the argument, but I think that the code section itself, the charge ultimately goes to the parcel of land it seems to me and it's not unclear to me as I read it, so ... that's my ruling on that."

Now the Souzas contend that their right to equal protection of the laws was violated because a similarly situated landowner in a district that used the county for levying assessments would only have had to pay a delinquent tenant's bill if the owner had requested water service in writing. There is no rational basis, they contend, for the difference in treatment. To avoid the necessity of invalidating Water Code section 36726, they further argue, we should construe that section as if it also contained a request-in-writing requirement. This is a distinctly different issue from the one the Souzas

raised in the trial court. The original argument was that section 36726 was ambiguous and the court should use section 37212 to resolve the ambiguity. The new argument is that section 36726 is unconstitutional if read literally and should be read as if it were the same as section 37212 to save it from invalidation.[4]

The Souzas are not entitled to raise the new issue for the first time on appeal. They argue that we may reach the issue even if it was not raised in the trial court because it presents a pure question of law.[5] There is no rule, however, that an appellate court *must* consider a pure question of law raised for the first time on appeal. Instead, the decision to do so or not "is largely a question of the appellate court's discretion." (*Redevelopment Agency v. City of Berkeley* (1978) 80 Cal.App.3d 158, 167 [143 Cal. Rptr. 633].) Here, we are dealing not with an erroneous ruling to which no objection was raised, but with an entire substantive theory of the defendant's liability--unconstitutionality of the operative statute--that was not litigated at all in the trial court. (7) Further, "we have an obligation to avoid deciding constitutional questions unless it is absolutely necessary to do so." *(City of Huntington Park v.*

---

[4]To the extent the Souzas' brief can be interpreted as *also* renewing the ambiguity argument the trial court rejected, we agree with the trial court's view. Water Code section 36726, subdivision (c), authorizes an add-on assessment and a lien on "the parcel upon which the water for which the charges are unpaid was used ... ." The assessment and lien are upon the land. The absence of an exception for tenant-occupied land is not an ambiguity.

[5]They also argue that their trial brief did raise "the constitutionality of these statutes," and they cite a page of their trial brief. The cited page, however, says nothing about equal protection. The only hint of a constitutional issue on the page is a parenthetical reference to "due process rights," accompanied by no argument or citation of authority of any kind.

Superior Court (1995) 34 Cal.App.4th 1293, 1299 [41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 68].) For these reasons, we decline to reach the equal protection issue.

IV. Governmental immunity

Because of the conclusions reached above, we need not discuss the district's argument that the Souzas' contract and invalid assessment claims should have been barred by governmental immunity.

V. Guaranty

The trial court ruled that the Souzas could recover against ACCO on the guaranty as third party beneficiaries for the same reasons the Souzas could recover against the district on the water agreement as third party beneficiaries: Paragraph 21 was intended to benefit the Souzas, so the guaranty, given pursuant to paragraph 21, must also have been intended to benefit them. This analysis would be erroneous even if the court's ruling on the water agreement was not. The water agreement and the guaranty are different contracts with different parties. The meaning of the guaranty and the intent of its parties cannot be inferred from the meaning of the water agreement and the intent of its parties. An independent analysis of the guaranty is necessary.

The Souzas propose an independent analysis in their brief. They assert that the district is the promisee, and acknowledge that Dave Ciapponi, who signed ACCO's guaranty letter on behalf of the district, did not testify that he had any intent that the Souzas would benefit by ACCO's performance. But they argue that Ciapponi's intent is irrelevant because he was not involved in negotiating the guaranty. Then they contend

that the promisee's purpose must be "determined by analyzing the purpose for which the guarantee was given ... ." This analysis in turn shows that the Souzas were intended beneficiaries because "a benefit to the landowner is inherent in the acceptance of a guarantee itself."

We reject this analysis also. Two considerations invalidate the judgment for the Souzas on the guaranty.

First, the Souzas could not recover as third party beneficiaries as a matter of law. If, as the Souzas argue, ACCO was the promisor, the district was the promisee, and the district intended ACCO's promise to benefit the Souzas, then the Souzas were entitled to enforce ACCO's performance, but could assert no greater rights than the district could. (*Marina Tenants Assn. v. Deauville Marina Development Co.*, *supra*, 181 Cal.App.3d at p. 132.) The district, however, could recover nothing from ACCO because it had already received full payment from the Souzas. The creditor in a suretyship[6] relationship--here, the district--cannot recover against the surety if it has already recovered the full amount of the debt from another source. "The creditor is entitled to only one performance, and if the creditor receives that by payment or other satisfaction, the surety is discharged." (23 Williston on Contracts (4th ed. 2002) § 61:11, p. 39.)

This principle was applied in *John P. Mills Organization, Inc. v. Unger* (1932) 215 Cal. 308 [9 P.2d 833], in which the Supreme Court considered a surety bond provided by a purchaser of land to the seller. The seller lent the purchase price to the purchaser and the purchaser agreed to build houses

---

[6]A guarantor is a surety. (1 Witkin, Summary of Cal. Law (10th ed. 2005) Contracts, § 1002, p. 1095.)

to certain specifications on the land. When the purchaser failed to build as specified and defaulted on the loan, the seller re-purchased the land at a trustee's sale for the full amount of the purchaser's indebtedness. Then it sued the surety to recover on the bond. (*Id.* at pp. 309-310.) Reasoning that if the purchaser had paid off the loan the seller would be entitled to nothing more--even if the purchaser had also failed to build as promised--the Supreme Court held that the trustee's sale satisfied the purchaser's obligation in full. As a result, there was no debt left for the bond to cover, and the surety was discharged. (*Id.* at pp. 310-311; see also *LeFlore v. Grass Harp Productions, Inc.* (1997) 57 Cal.App.4th 824, 828-830, 840 [67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 340] [guarantor discharged when principal satisfied obligation to creditor].)

Because the district, having been paid in full, was in no position to collect any more money on the guaranty, its alleged third party beneficiaries, the Souzas, could not do so either. It makes no difference that it was the Souzas themselves who paid the district. "Payment by a third person does not change the result. If the third party wishes to keep the obligation alive, that party must buy the obligation, not pay it." (23 Williston, *supra*, § 61:11 at p. 41.) In other words, the only way the Souzas could have avoided discharging the guaranty when they paid the water charges would have been to ask the district to assign its claim against ACCO to them first.

The second reason the Souzas cannot recover on the guaranty as third party beneficiaries is that there was no substantial evidence that the promisee intended the Souzas to be beneficiaries. As the Souzas' brief acknowledges, the extrinsic evidence (Ciapponi's testimony) provides no support for their position, and they must rely on the terms of the guaranty itself, as expressed in the letter from ACCO signed by the district and

the Beebowers. The Souzas' brief states: "The only relevant evidence presented at trial was the plain language of the Water Agreement ... ." But the letter does not identify the Souzas, individually or as part of a class of intended beneficiaries, and does not purport to confer any benefit on them. It is insufficient to observe, as the Souzas do, that they would inevitably benefit from performance of the guaranty because they were secondarily liable for the debt. The Souzas have cited no authority, and we know of none, supporting the notion that every party on whom the burden to pay a debt will fall if a contract to pay it is breached is necessarily a third party beneficiary of that broken contract. In short, the evidence was sufficient to establish no more than that the Souzas were incidental beneficiaries of the guaranty.[7]

The trial court erred in ruling that the Souzas could recover on the ACCO guaranty as third party beneficiaries. In view of this, it is unnecessary to discuss ACCO's argument that it did not breach the guaranty agreement.

VI. Attorneys' fees and costs

Because we hold that the court erred in entering judgment for the Souzas, we need not consider the district's arguments about why the grounds the court relied on in awarding attorneys' fees and costs do not support the award. Instead, the award of attorneys' fees and costs is reversed because the Souzas are not prevailing parties.

---

[7]The Souzas' claim in their cross-appeal that the district should not get an offset for payments by ACCO is mooted by our holding.

VII. Conclusion

Water Code section 36726, subdivision (c), is a simple law. It permits a water district to add unpaid water charges to an assessment on the land where the water was used. Where the district chooses to do this, the law makes the owners of the land responsible for the unpaid charges. Nothing that happened in this case relieved the Souzas of that responsibility.

DISPOSITION

The judgments in favor of the Souzas against the district and ACCO and the award of attorneys' fees are reversed. The Souzas' cross-appeal is dismissed as moot. Costs are awarded to appellants.

/s/Wiseman
Wiseman, J.

WE CONCUR:

/s/ Vartabedian
Vartabedian, Acting P. J.

/s/ J. Gomes
Gomes, J.